

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Planning & Development Center  
Main Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**January 13, 2011  
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

---

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT&PF, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
John Crapps	MOA/Traffic Department
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Planning Department
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Jody Karcz	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation

Also in attendance

---

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development Department (CDD)
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CCD
Van Le	MOA/CCD
Erika McConnell	MOA/CCD
Jon Spring	MOA/Consultant
Alton Staff	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Bart Rudolph	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF)
Dustin Heigtzman	ADOT&PF
Mark Parmelee	ADOT&PF
Walt Parker	ACC
Cheryl Richardson	ACC
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates
Joel Ullring	Golder Associates, Inc.
Tim Ebber	Home Away From Home
Rep Pierce	Alaska Legislature
Anne Brooks	Brooks & Associates
Laurie Cummings	HDR
John McPherson	HDR
Bob Speer	

Emma Speer

Ken Morton

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR CRAPPS called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

MR. LYON encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

CHAIR CRAPPS moved to approve the agenda. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

MR. LYON the obligation report, which is quarterly, there is a small enough changes for staff to approve not business and down to informational items. Move 5a down to informational items.

5b postponed. Came up during the PZC but minutes have not been released yet in order to draft resolution and put off for a month.

MS. EPSTEIN 5c the Chair and I discussed the draft resolution today as a business item; it was posted on web, but not listed on distributed agenda. It should be listed.

MS. KARCZ approved as amended. MR. COWLES seconded. No objections.

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES - None**

MS. KARCZ mentioned there is a lot of frustration with the meeting. The minutes not coming to AMATS in a timely manner and made a motion to have staff come up with a resolution to the issue. MS. RICE seconded.

MS. WITT clarified this would direct staff, to look at the UPWP and how to perhaps fund contractual services to get this done. MS. KARCZ accepted this as a friendly amendment. ANNE BROOKS stressed the importance of having timely minutes approved as she files the minutes for each project as a record of attending and it is difficult to put a public involvement

summary if minutes have not been approved. MS. WITT requested a UPWP amendment for the next meeting and how this will be paid for if contracted out.

No objections.

## **5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **a. OBLIGATION REPORT - Moved to informational item**

### **b. EAGLE RIVER CBD STUDY – Pulled & to be rescheduled**

MS. WITT stated people may be here to testify and want to know why it was postponed and how it impacts our LRTP schedule. MS. UNDERWOOD the PZC approved recommending the study unanimously; however, Ms Underwood did not feel comfortable bringing it forward yet, as the minutes were not yet available. The Commission had a public hearing Dec. 6 and met Dec. 13, and she needs the minutes to draft the resolution. MR. WEAVER you can do a resolution from the audio portion, and if there were not that many comments, go back to the audio to get the document approved by this body and Policy Committee with the resolution. MS UNDERWOOD did not know she could do that and didn't want to interpret the minutes differently from the person who transcribes the minutes. She is confident the only recommendations that come from the study for the MTP are the top 6, and judging by what PZC said, and our discussions, it makes sense for the top 6, which are for the higher classification streets, to be considered. MS. WITT asked if it was safe to say we'll have a document before us next month to adopt. MS. UNDERWOOD no, not to adopt; we intend to bring the draft study to the Assembly and it's not scheduled yet. MR. LYON whatever changes PZC suggested will come back to TAC, then to Assembly, and then back to us, and then to PC. MS. UNDERWOOD noted this study does not have to be taken to the Assembly. MS. UNDERWOOD stated we can bring to you, to the committee, but we have told the public we would take it to the Assembly, but we don't have to. CHAIR CRAPPS put on TAC agenda as a business item for next month.

MS. WITT identify recommendations on how to get this approved in lock step with the LRTP even if bringing them both forward together at the same time.

### **c. 2035 LRTP UPDATE – RESOLUTION, MEMO**

Public involvement plan. Jon Spring is the project manager on this project. MR. SPRING requested the TAC to make a motion to approve the public involvement plan including their recommendations.

Consulting team is made up of Ann Brooks w/Brooks & Associates and Gary Katsion w/Kittelson.

- 3 items, after discussion the initial discussion with the TAC last month it became clear we needed an executive oversight committee to help guide the plan development. This committee would not supplant the TAC, but serve as an ongoing direction that we need. Composed of Jennifer, AMATS Coord, Mr. Lyon, Gary Katsion, Jon Spring and unnamed executive of Muni. Similar to what was done with LRTP.
- 2) The TAC directly and their role in the planning process. The recommendations of Safetea-Lu and the planning process, TAC represents a lot of those stakeholders, DOT, DEC, Muni, some citizens but other stakeholders that need to be brought into the process. In order to fully comply with Safetea-Lu requirements we need to bring in these other stakeholders. Identified 6, AMATS Freight Adv. Comm., Muni Transit Adv. Comm., Matsu Borough, rep from environmental organization, CBERRRSA Board, Homeland Security, Native Tribes and the Military to make it a fully rounded out project technical advisory committee.
- 3) Development of the public involvement plan. Ann Brooks has put together a more fleshed out version than seen in the past it identifies the specific public involvement activities will be, presentations delivery, how to address Environmental stakeholders requirements, and the final public approval process (see memo).

MS. BROOKS noted ongoing public outreach would be using AMATS contact notice and the website to get information out. For early awareness building, we wanted to do a transportation fair but if you look at the environmental justice issues and guidance from FHWA if we prepared a newspaper notice we would have a broader outreach for about same amount of money. Do presentations of Municipal Boards and Commissions as part of the early outreach and funnel comments to PZC. Part of the reason is because we received an early comment from FHWA regarding a broader input that ultimately comes from PZC acting as the Citizens' Advisory Comm. Once we have draft documents, public review and public hearing drafts we would rely on the TAC, PZC as portals from the public. MR. KATSION stated there would be 2 public hearings one in E.R. and one in Anchorage to review the public review draft.

MS. EPSTEIN asked how would you funnel comments to the PZC. MS. BROOKS all comments received during the public review process would be provided to PZC when they are reviewing the document. MS. EPSTEIN would there be minutes from the groups? MS. BROOKS noted generally are for boards and commissions, which could be funneled to PZC as well. MS. EPSTEIN mentioned that add'l representatives not talked about is the non-motorized transportation committee and might be a way to bring them in. Mr. Lyon stated he has a list of groups for the non-motorized transportation adv committee. MS. EPSTEIN thought of Carol King because she does public health, works for the state and is very involved.

MS. EPSTEIN looking over the public involvement plan and did not see any online publications, Alaska dispatch or blogs, and it might be worth looking at that for more coverage. MR. LYON

noted that he was pretty sure FHWA and FTA are adamant about print ads being done. Both are good ideas.

MS. WITT noted under 1, exec oversight committee, Public Transportation Director would be good to be included. MR. SPRING in addition to Muni exec or the same, but transit should have a seat at the table. MR. LYON stated we had one meeting to get started, and he suggested that the Public Transportation Director be that 5<sup>th</sup> person. MS. WITT requested having someone from mayor's office as well.

MS. WITT made a motion to recommend approval of establishment of EOC or by each individually. MS. KARCZ motioned. MR. HANSEN seconded.

MS. WITT suggested adding the Public Transportation Director to that group. MS. KARCZ seconded. MR. COWLES asked now with 6 is there a danger of a tie vote. MR. SPRING stated it was more of a consensus organization as opposed to a voting organization. Don't expect that to happen. MR. LYON noted if something could not be resolved it could be brought to the TAC. MR. KATSION stated the MOA exec person needs to be identified and assigned as soon as possible as another meeting is scheduled for next week. MS. HEIL mentioned put out an invitation to Mayor to partake and if they don't, then move forward. MR. LYON request was made to Muni Mayor's office. Move forward with as complete a group as possible.

CHERYL RICHARDSON asked will EOC be public because she doesn't recall hearing about them. MR. SPRING stated we can't notify in paper due to lag time. There are going to set regular meetings for every Wednesday, and it could be posted on AMATS website for notification of meetings. MS. KARCZ asked if the intent of the EOC is to have a public meeting or to keep the project on schedule. MR. SPRING intent is not to draw a lot of public input but make decisions on the planning process. Appropriate for public to know, we won't be asking for public hearing or input. MS. KARCZ mentioned the TAC meetings are open to the public and agenda items will include the LRTP. MR. SPRING the EOC reports to TAC and in that sense there is a chance for public weigh in on.

MS. RICE noted its technical guidance and decision making not a public hearing process at that point. MR. HANSEN stated the EOC is confusing as an acronym can we call it something else. MR. KATSION remarked we can call it the Project Oversight Committee instead of EOC.

MR. SPRING I would like to clarify the need to listing the POC on website for public notice. Potential UPWP amendment related to public involvement. MR. KATSION noted it was project administration issues, its not technical issues or policies.

MR. COWLES asked if truly oversight or is that a function of TAC and the PC; the title is important. MR. SPRING noted examples are talking about is financial plan, parts of plans, DOT

and MOA preparing cost estimates for their projects, EOC will discuss. Making sure both are in sync with each other and an issue that needs to be resolved.

MR. HANSEN left meeting at 3:13 p.m.

MR. KATSION mentioned the primary function of the group is to provide the consultant team and public staff guidance so we get this done in a timely fashion. We can't afford to wait once a month for direction if an issue on schedule or budget comes up. Right now we are scheduling meetings every 2 weeks. Keep on time, on schedule and on budget, and that is what this committee is doing. Big policy or technical issues get brought back to the TAC.

MS. WITT stated she doesn't see a reason for posting as part of public process. MR. KATSION stated it's like any other project administrative grouping – those are not public meetings. There are plenty of opportunity for public input and involvement. There are at least 2 official meetings each month with TAC and PC. Mr. SPRING noted the one in 2005 I don't believe there was public notice.

MS. PEASE from Eagle River are we talking the year 2035? MR. SPRING responded yes. She noted she did not know these meetings went on for years.

MR. MORRIS asked to delay public involve plan and discuss resolution for Ms. Epstein due to time constraints.

No objections on part 1 approved as amended.

**c. 2035 LRTP RESOLUTION**

MR. RUDOLPH mentioned at end of December, some agencies who had staff directly impacted during negotiation of contract these agencies met and talked about how staff would be impacted and identified some assumptions that were not necessarily clear with all TAC and we created a draft version of those assumptions to present to staff for discussion. Resolution is in Draft form and ready to be looked over.

MS. HEIL regardless of whether we come to agree or not agree, I really think we need something because we have a big project to do and needs to go in a timely fashion, and get a lot accomplished, and if we don't put boundaries on this it will explode. Important to manage expectations from the public and from the mgmt above us and we go through this every 4 years as long as an LRTP is in place -as long as transportation legislation says that. We need to make decisions now on how we want to do these updates. It is not a review of the plan; we are trying to meet the needs and requirements in a logical, efficient, informed manner. Look at it from a technical prospective and the goals we want to meeting are clearly identified, our boundaries and

expectations to give contractor clear direction and a consistent need to the public they know what to expect and we can move forward. There is controversy here. Need to be focused. Hot button issues and at least get something to PC at next meeting so staff and contractors can really get moving.

MS. WITT asked as a TAC member and approaching the LRTP amendment was already largely already done from the last amendment; stuff already got through and updated the LRTP to reflect all the requirements. I understood this effort was, and as a group already agreed to use the ISER assumptions for 2035 used in the H2H Model, which are actually lower than what we used in 2027 effort. Also as a TAC member the concern about the KAC, and need to address and how to address. There has been a long and lengthy debate and the PC itself kept it where it is – in short term. We do need to have that conversation because it's so fresh and the whole public process was less than a year ago. She thought at the last TAC that decision had already been made. Important parameter on this LRTP for public review.

MS. EPSTEIN appreciate and understand need certain parameters to make process work. Is concerned about managing public expectations. Real problem for me and members of the public is if we have some presumptions and can't weigh in and can't change them like the KAC. No additional money coming from the State or local funds, from a technical standard point that has changed and have whole new set of numbers and what is important we don't talk about the mega projects being different because they are so costly they affect all the other projects and to put those off limits at this point and would argue that is technically unsound. Haven't talked to FHWA or FTA, if they hard the public couldn't do anything that would be a problem. Assumption in earlier LRTP that the monies associated with KAC would not be part of fiscal constraint analysis, when our certification people came in we said that doesn't make since if there were short falls and could draw so many other projects including the bridge. She would not like to see that particular whereas and don't think we could include it with a special status.

MS. WITT noted you are correct. FHWA does want to see KAC in the financial analysis and in terms of moving forward on the capital side the perimeters would carry forward, and what we would have to do then is to have more information from KABATA on how it is going to their project to be included in LRTP. Second page all relevant recommendations would be directed back to us.

MS. EPSTEIN stated maybe numbers will work maybe they won't. This assumption the committee should not included it without all info we need.

MS. WITT noted other reason this resolution was brought forward was to make sure everyone was mindful of the LRTP turning into a pumpkin in June. Don't know where staff is at requesting extension with FHWA. We are at tremendous risk of losing the program if we don't deliver in that general timeframe. This is where the aggressive public participation plan and

everything is done. Putting this whereas just so we can have the discussion public and as a TAC to be in agreement as to the expectations. It's not something that can be achieved in a reasonable timeframe. Whether stated this way, or modify another whereas to start with projects in the currently adopted LRTP, as long as we have that. MS. EPSTEIN noted as long as it's in there.

MS. KARCZ asked if it would be possible to delete the 11th whereas and the 8<sup>th</sup> one that talks about the needs for projects to be modified to accomplish the same thing.

MS. HEIL requested before we begin with each whereas, need to agree this is what we are working on. Is it appropriate motion to work on this that everyone agrees and work on individuals whereas as needed.

MR. LYON suggested that general discussion, then public comments, then whereas by whereas because once motion you don't have input from public. CHAIR CRAPPS noted general comments from committee, then comments from public, then back to committee.

MS. HEIL stated yes we do.

MR. WEAVER noted 2<sup>nd</sup> page, 2<sup>nd</sup> whereas, Craig did you draft this language? Does this read appropriately? MR. RUDOLPH stated anything approved since the LRTP was adopted and has already been through public involvement process. That we are not opening them back up.

MS. WITT noted those projects included in studies and plans after the LRTP.

CHAIR CRAPPS requested public comments and then make decision from there.

CAT PIERCE asked on KAC project my question is, if you don't remove #11, it sounds like maybe it will be taken out as a short term project even through says it will be a short-term project. MR. RUDLOPH affirmed that it will be very difficult.

CHERYL RICHARDSON noted how wonderful that there is a resolution and gives a whole lot of us a heads up and forwarded thinking progress. I'm interested in several whereas.

- Concerned about the model being used to confirm the need for the project and that language speaks to road construction and hope you'll consider dropping in language needs to include transit, bike and walk spending projects. A bit heavy on the road construction here.
- #9, goals and objectives will be confirmed as relevant. Believe it is appropriate in Anchorage's life as a city need to evaluate the progress we are making in the LRTP goals and objectives and how LRTP has contributed to meeting those goals and objections tie our progress directly to the LRTP. Also watched AMATS in past pull

- extensions on the LRTP extensions. It seems rather than slide quickly and dirty through a 4 year project, do it right and not just run for June deadline.
- #11 agrees with conversation to date. The participation plan has a purpose and some goals and some objections and right now I see a list of activities but want to see more than a list of activities. Such things as what is the public opinion, how will you assess the public opinion and how would you report public opinion to us. How will public be involved, to be informed because that is what it looks like now. She wants to the feedback loop into the plan.

MARY ANN PEASE, rep KABATA. This resolution is an excellent idea and it sets out the key assumptions and parameters that you go through and work under. Getting it out and on table up front was a good idea and think having 11 in there as is appropriate. The rod, a formal federal approval of the Environmental Impact was received on Dec. 15 on Knik Bridge that is essentially a go ahead to building the project on using the Erickson alternative. Although she does believe in public comment and should be used to its full extent.

MR. LYON noted re extensions in the certification review FHWA and FTA where very clear in terms of extension for June deadline, if we want an extension, they are open if we have very clear reasons and timelines about what specific things we would want to do but don't have the time to do.

MR. HANSEN back 3:40

MR. LYON stated once we get the public involvement plan approved and what specific things were going to do in the timeframe then we can write it up very clearly and put in request to FHWA and FTA for an extension and we should have it on its way relatively soon.

MS. WITT noted once we get FHWA and FTA certification comments, they will in part drive that and what they expect in terms of building the KAC financial plan into the LRTP and demonstrating constraints in the LRTP. This is an enormous challenge and not sure how it can be met in that timeframe and the FHWA and FTA are in the driver's seat for determining our meeting their deadline.

MS. HEIL moved to approve resolution recommending adoption of the key assumptions and parameters of the AMATS 2035 Long-Range Transportation Plan Update for the Policy Committee. MS. KARCZ second.

MS. EPSTEIN would propose an amendment to remove 11<sup>th</sup> whereas as a friendly amendment because it appears 8<sup>th</sup> whereas would cover some of the questions. MS. WITT asked to add on to make it clearer because the starting point is the existing 2027 LRTP so in 4<sup>th</sup> whereas the new

2035 MTP will build upon a major amendment reflecting draft Chapter 13 making it compliant requirements.

MS. HEIL noted the process when the model used to work on trans network and from air quality perspective is the conformity and have to know what your network is going to be to determine if the emissions will be constrained in order to do those model runs have to know what projects are in plan and what they are going to look like. It's really hard for the modelers to know what the network looks like about when so when are we making a decision so we can move on with those types of analysis.

MR. SPRING stated the way the work plan is set up now is once TAC and PC decide on projects that are going to be in the public hearing draft then a conformity analysis. There is still possibility that through the public hearing process that can be dropped but we felt comfortable then with the time extension with the projects will continue on. It's also important to the public to know when they review it what the air quality impacts are. MS. HEIL mentioned this is educational for a lot of people the model and the projects in the model are critical to run the model and the analysis and one of the driving forces in our timeline for getting the LRTP completed.

MR. MORRIS noted I'm against dropping the section on KAC. It's the elephant in the room. It's 80% of the last LRTP and we have to be very clear. It is a different project than other projects in the plan and we need to modify that section to make it clear and we need to address the project in this resolution.

MR. MORRIS mentioned H2H not as controversial.

CHAIR CRAPPS motioned to delete 11 and add to draft to item 4 under Chapter 13. MR. COWLES asked why not just state that short term projects remain the same and leave it the same. MS EPSTEIN objects. Not object is they are starting point. Use previous LRTP as a starting point. MR. COWLES maybe that is what I wanted to say.

MS. WITT noted she understand and agree Steve is absolutely right.

MR. MORRIS noted this is the direction staff is getting to develop the plan. Establish the need for the project does that mean run the network with and without the need for the KAC again. We don't have luxury or time to do that. If in fact the plan is not fiscally constrained all projects up for reconsideration and staff proceeds with that analysis and staff determines that it meets fiscal constraints. If it does then that is the draft to the public. The public has the option to say we don't want the KAC in there. MS. EPSTEIN noted this is a different project in there now because they have gone to the legislature for money and the LRTP says they will not do that. So there is a factual change and to ask public not to comment is crazy.

MS. WITT stated the statement has to stay the same too. MS. EPSTEIN replied keep that statement in there. MS. WITT noted the key amendment where KABATA succeeded on their own or did not, that was the side boards when we added for 2027. MS. EPSTEIN asked if we keep statement 11 in there still predetermining an outcome and different than starting with existing LRTP and existing statements.

MS. HEIL asked if KAC remains as a short term project for the initial analysis or modeling or how would you word that. MR. MORRIS replied to change the resolution amending recommendation of adoption key assumptions and parameters guiding the preparation of the draft AMATS 2035 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We are not in any sense predetermining the outcome. The projects before stay in and we'll model that and determine whether plan is still physically constrained and if not we may have to drop KAC, H2H and drop a # of projects. The second part of the amendment—the section dealing with KAC and making it longer but whereas the KAC will remain in 2035 LRTP as a short term project unless the financial analysis determines projects must be removed to meet fiscal constraints. If so it along with other projects may be reconsidered.

MS. KARCOZ mentioned at the last PC Mr. Flynn asked staff to look into putting in the long term. MS. WITT noted he made that statement but gave no direction and that's why this is important to get this to the PC to make sure that is understanding. Huge implications on financial analysis.

MS. HEIL we need to have something done to open up this up to chat. Then go back and look at. We have to have something to look at.

MR. LYON stated their' a motion by Lois and motion by Steve. Lois withdrew her motion. Keep Mr. Morris'.

MR. MORRIS motioned and seconded by MR. COWLES. CHAIR CRAPPS modify 11 and title and #4 to add draft to Chapter 13. No objection to this part.

MS. HEIL requested her friendly amendment be added from first motion to second motion.

Ms. EPSTEIN left at 3:58 p.m. before this vote.

MS. WITT looking at 7<sup>th</sup> whereas, the model determines the need for the projects - the intent is to incorporate the bike and ped plans. Looking for a way to incorporate the intent for this LRTP to specifically say the bike and ped plans. MS. KARCOZ replied #14 only those projects included in plans or studies that have been completed and approved. MS. HEIL will be considered for incorporation and modeling?

MR. SPRING noted the model does have multi-modal output for # of bicycle riders, peds and walkers but you're talking about requirements and Safetea-Lu has us incorporate sidewalk and bicycle projects in the LRTP, which come out of existing adopted plans.

MS. WITT motioned road, bicycle pedestrian and transit projects included in plans or studies that have been completed and adopted after the approval of the 2007 Anchorage Bowl and Chugiak-Eagle River LRTPs will be given priority for incorporation into the 2035 Anchorage LRTP. MS. HEIL seconded modification to 14. No objections to modified 14. Approved.

Ms. Epstein okayed the changes before she left.

MS. HEIL moved to have resolution signed by Chair on behalf of the TAC. MS. RICE seconded. Unanimously approved on such and such a date. No objections approved.

Any objections with 3 changes made. No objections. Approved.

### **5c – PART 2**

MS. HEIL asked Jon to clarify what the additional stakeholders would only be commenting or voting on specific business items on the LRTP. Are you thinking of structuring TAC meetings where so we have notice when we have extra element at bottom or top so they can go and then do rest of our business. MR. SPRING replied that is the intent. It would have to be a 2-part meeting. MR. KATSION also noted in addition there may be special meetings for the TAC+ on the project to meet to expedite the schedule. Drafted up what those meetings are going to consist of between now and end of April. MS. HEIL mentioned in the past it has been helpful to have work sessions with TAC before coming to meeting so if there are a lot of technical stuff so we can talk it out or have it precede actual meeting. Some work sessions would be helpful. MR. KATSION responded with the technical project meeting it may not be on the same date because of schedule. We plan setup information within the next week or two on expectations of this group. MS. WITT asked if we need to have more frequent TAC meetings or whatever – we'll do what we need to do.

MS. BROOKS noted in February the PPP calls for a joint meeting in Eagle River; Feb. 24 is that joint meeting.

MR. MORRIS discussed adding non-motorized representative to the TAC. It was taken care of.

MS. RICHARDSON thanked the committee for following through on the localized non-motorized position on the committee.

MS. HEIL move to approve the second item to include stakeholders for working on the LRTP update issues. MS. RICE seconded.

MS. HEIL motioned to add as one of the stakeholders a non-motorized representative. Second by MS. RICE. Approved.

Overall second vote on part 2 – no objections approved overall motion.

### **5c - PART 3**

MS. RICHARDSON reiterated we are hoping for a public involvement process to have stated purpose and outcomes that also include assessing public opinion, reporting what public had to say and how plan was affect by public opinion expressed. Other point, it would be easy for the public involvement folks - what that level of involvement is anticipated. Is it to inform the public or is it a 2-way street. What level the public involvement process involves.

MS. BROOKS replied we will be at an involved level as public hearing drafts come out. We are going into it at an informed level because we're not asking for new projects, but public is free to comment and in the public review draft to talk about specific projects and then be able to address them as either in or out because of fiscal constraints.

MS. RICHARDSON noted the LRTP is the big shot, big picture, the 20 year horizon for the community. An individual project like KABATA is a big deal for a lot of the folks. Also a big deal on how much weight we give for non-motorized, for transit and not just a project. Our community asked about the future of Anchorage and what we want to see 20 years out and how we can get there. Hope it is more than just this project.

MS. KARZCZ moved to approve the public involvement plan. MR. MORRIS second.

MS. HEIL asked didn't we added in blogs, did we want to. MS. WITT question on social media and the State received specific direction on what they can't do. Not sure about Muni. We could say recommend looking into and use where appropriate. CHAIR CRAPPS Mr. Lyon mentioned FHWA/FTA had specific ideas. MS. WITT responded on paper. MS. BROOKS noted she's talking about Alaska Dispatch and other online media. MS. HEIL would like to see something added in the plan, and edit that before approving.

MS. BROOKS replied we can put it in ongoing. Or even if we have a press conf we could add other media to that and their getting notice. MS. HEIL motion to amend to online publications and other media. MS. KARZCZ mentioned there will be an on-line website with the project. This just gives us an outline. MR. COWLES stated online media. Under ongoing add online media.

MS. HEIL moved. MS. WITT seconded. No objections and approved. Under ongoing on attachment A.

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDMENT – no objection to item 3 and approved.

**d. 2010 UPWP, MINOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT**

MR. LYON noted this was a minor adjustment to 2010 PL funds. At end of year we cannot be over 110% of budget so overall we are under budget for year, but for some items we are over. So this moves some funding in one element into another element. See staff memo stating housekeeping. We ask for TAC approval then we notify PC and DOT. We are asking for your approval.

MR. MORRIS moved to approve 5d. MR. HANSEN seconded. No objections. Approved.

**e. OTHER BUSIENSS ITEMS - None**

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**b. OBLIGATION REPORT**

MR. RUDOLPH reported on the first quarter obligation and includes TIP Amendment #1, which has not been approved yet still needs to go to Assembly and back.

TIP Amendment #1 funds cannot be obligated until TIP amendment has been approved. If TIP Amend is postponed it postpones those projects. Some of these projects:

- Victor Rd approved on separate resolution. Good to go and already in process.
- Dowling Road, TIP #1 21.6 m is fully fund Phase 1 through TIP amendment.
- Page 2 – couple de-obligations. How we balanced the ob report.
- Muldoon Rd is currently in construction and waiting on TIP amendment approval.
- Pg 3 – CMAQ projects. Ride Share transit marketing already gone through and pumped that up \$20,000. Direct transfer to FTA.
- Red bar at bottom required to be +/- of 15 percent, we're within 3%, already pretty close, but early in the year.

MS. WITT asked when the TAC will get the TIP amendment back for final approval. MR. LYON replied we should get into pace system tomorrow to show up on Assembly docket and should know schedule tomorrow. We had to go to PZC first. Getting on PZC agenda, and then once on agenda, and our date was Dec. 13 meeting.

**a. HIGH PRIORITY TRANSIT COORIDOR**

Alton Staff provided a summary overview of the High Priority Transit Corridor study funded through AMATS. The purpose of the study was to sustain ridership achievements since 2002, and to examine strategies and initiatives that may be most effective to further improve service, productivity and ridership

He discussed the features of a transit supportive development corridor which include:

- Medium to high-density housing (over 8 du/acre) within 1/4 mile of the major street at the center of the corridor
- Small scale commercial sites oriented to the street
- Multi-modal facilities, emphasizing bus, pedestrian, and bicycle transportation
- Expanded sidewalks and crosswalks, street furniture, bus shelters, and landscape improvements
- Route 7-Spenard was selected as a prototype corridor to study with the following considerations: Route coverage, Service headways, Ridership, Bus running times, On-time performance, Stop spacing, Coordination among routes, Origin-destination patterns, Transit signal priority, and Household socio-economic profiles along the corridor

MS. WITT asked if the current Transit Signal Priority provided conditions to when a bus changes a signal. MR. STAFF stated Transit uses low priority right now. This clears the pedestrian signal and gives buses the green if possible. With a conditional it will first see if the bus is late, and if it isn't it won't change the signal at intersection. Operating on very little complaints. Still need to get final Assembly approval for the Transit Signal Priority continuation.

**c. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

MS. KARCZ took advantage of the opportunity to mention Alton is retiring at end of February, and she has requested to go back to Transit Manager Position. Lance Wilber was suggested as my replacement and he will be starting in February.

MS. HEIL stated nice job to CHAIR CRAPPS.

**d. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Policy Committee, January 27, 2011

Technical Advisory Committee, February 10, 2011

Feb 3 may be the first TAC plus meeting.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m. Adjourned.